

REMARKS

This RCE is filed with an amendment for the consideration of the examiner in light of the following remarks.

The Examiner has reviewed applicant's amendment and remarks filed May 18, 2005 and respectfully disagreed for the reason that the content displayed to the user in the Chang reference is HTML content that has been subjected to HTTP processing such that the user does not select how services subscribed to are displayed and in consequence an easy to use display is created for the user. This is compared to/deemed the same as the claimed subject-matter.

Applicants still respectfully disagree, substantially for the same reasons as previously presented, but have nevertheless amended claim 1 without prejudice to further distinguish over Chang.

In detail, the cited passage of Chang now referred to by the Examiner (column 18, line 66 - column 19, line 11) deals with displaying information to the user in the form of static web pages. However, column 19, lines 2 and 3 expressly state that those static web pages are provided to the user "*in response to web browser based requests from the users.*" This has to be considered in combination with column 20, lines 16 to 27. Namely, "...a user operates a PC or other terminal device for Internet-web browsing. . . . and select[s] a page . . . relating to AIN services" and . . . "[a]lternatively, the user might select a page relating to switch based services."

Of course, the user does not select *how* services subscribed to are displayed but evidently, according to Chang, the user is required to select *which* services subscribed to are displayed.

In view of this rather fundamental difference, the remarks presented in the amendment filed 18 May 2005 should still be valid.

Nevertheless, to reflect this difference, the wording of claim 1 has been amended.

In this regard, applicants would like to emphasize and clarify that the user does *not* have to select a content/web page which is presented to him as a user interface and that a determination of which profile type is selected to be modified is made at the browsing means. Briefly stated (see paragraph [0083] of the published application on page 10, line 28 to page 11, line 4 of the application), "...when receiving user input, the WML content deduces depending on the information on the current registered profile, which service management or control procedures must be applied...". If the rejection is to be maintained, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to give reasons on why claim features appearing in the "determining" step and its alternative subparagraphs are suggested/anticipated by the Chang reference.

Additionally, as will be noted the above claim 1 has been further amended to incorporate features of claim 6 which has been canceled.

Namely, according to the present invention, the user may modify its subscriber profiles using his communication device, whereas according to Chang, the user modifies its subscriber profiles using a terminal which is distinct from a communication device. that is, according to Chang, the user has to operate a PC or other terminal device for internet web browsing. An event referring to the actual communication device such as a mobile phone, according to Chang, however, does not trigger any possibility to modify profiles.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-28, 30 and 31 is requested.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 29, claim 29 depends from claim 27 which in turn depends from claim 1. Claim 27 further limits claim 1 to the content discovering the capabilities of the network when the user attaches to the network or enters the area of a new service switching device. Respectfully, the Examiner has not addressed this limitation of claim 27 in making the obviousness rejection of claim 29 but merely refers to the use of the CAMEL service in related art which is mentioned by the applicant in the specification at page 1. Although the

Examiner mentions claim 27 in the novelty rejection, pointing to column 20, lines 47-58 of Chang, the discovery and attachment process referred to by Chang do not specifically show or even suggest the limitations of claim 27. Therefore, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 29 is requested.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of August 24, 2005, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-5 and 7-31 to issue is earnestly solicited.

16 Nov 05
Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

Tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955

Respectfully submitted,
Francis J. Maguire
Francis J. Maguire
Registration No. 31,391